

Paper #1

Answer one and only **one** of the following two sets of questions:

1. Describe and evaluate Thomson's argument for the claim that abortions are morally permissible under certain conditions even when we assume that the aborted fetus is a person. Make sure to discuss the two hypothetical examples we discussed in class (i.e. the violinist scenario and the scenario involving people-plants) and explain how these examples are used by Thomson to support her conclusions. After you've given a clear exposition of Thomson's arguments, you must present **criticisms** of those arguments. If you think Thomson is right, you must show how she can answer these criticisms; if you think Thomson is wrong you must show why these criticisms are not effectively answered by the things that Thomson says.

Note: At no point should you write, "I think Thomson is right," or "I think Thomson is wrong" without also explaining your **reasons** or **evidence** for holding the view in question. This essay should not be entirely devoted to a description of Thomson's views and a report on your feelings about those views. You must, of course, describe Thomson's views accurately, but you must **also** address them in a critical fashion, using **good reasons** to either argue for or against holding them.

2. (a) What is a just war theory? (b) Would a correct just war theory condone **preemptive** wars under certain conditions? (bi) If not, why not? (bii) If so, under what conditions? (c) Was the US invasion of Iraq justifiable as a preemptive war? (ci) If you think so, explain why. (cii) If you think not, explain why not. (di) If you think the US **cannot** justify the war on Iraq as a morally permissible act of self-defense or a morally permissible attempt to preempt an attack on its citizens, might the war still be justified as an attempt to rid Iraq (and the world) of a cruel and evil dictator and instill a democratic regime with a respect for human rights in place of that dictator? (dii) If you think the US invasion of Iraq **is** morally justified on grounds of preemption **imagine for the sake of argument** that it were not, and address the same question: might it nevertheless be justified by the tyranny and cruelty of Saddam? (That is, if you're answering (dii), you're addressing whether we can cite more than one good reason for invading Iraq.) (e) Make sure that when you answer either (di) or (dii) that you: (e) Describe the conditions under which a correct just war theory would say that a nation A can justifiably attack a nation B when B has not attacked A and B does not imminently threaten to attack A.

Due 10/22/08 in class

To earn an 'A' your paper must answer all of the questions under (1) or all of the questions under (2), and you must do it well.

The paper must be 4-5 pages long, double-spaced text in a normal font (e.g. Times New Roman 12 pt.), with normal tabs and margins (e.g. Microsoft Word's default settings).